

# A FLOER FUNDAMENTAL GROUP

J.-F. BARRAUD

**ABSTRACT.** The main purpose of this paper is to provide a description of the fundamental group of a symplectic manifold in terms of Floer theoretic objects.

As an application, we show that when counted with a suitable notion of multiplicity, non degenerate Hamiltonian diffeomorphisms have enough fixed points to generate the fundamental group.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

**1.1. Presentation of the results.** In many ways, the topology of a space influences its geometry, and this is particularly true in symplectic geometry. Having a symplectic interpretation of a topological invariant is a good tool to explore this relationship. The celebrated Floer Homology ([7][8]) is of course a strong illustration of this phenomenon. Introduced to prove the homological version of the Arnold conjecture ([1]), it quickly became one of the most powerful tools in symplectic geometry.

However, all the techniques derived from the original Floer construction are homological, or at least chain complex based in nature. The notion of cobordism (among moduli spaces) is even at the root of the original ideas of M. Gromov [9] of using pseudo-holomorphic curves to derive invariants in symplectic geometry. The use of local coefficients in Floer complexes allows Floer theory to involve some homotopical invariants, but purely homotopical tools are still missing, and it is the goal of this paper to provide a Floer theoretic interpretation of the fundamental group.

All the objects this construction is based on are still classical Floer theoretic objects, but the essential non Abelian phenomena that make the difference between the first fundamental and the first homology groups are caught by a deeper use of 1-dimensional moduli spaces, and the use of “augmentations”.

More precisely, let  $(M, \omega)$  be a connected closed monotone symplectic manifold and  $(H, J)$  a generic choice of Hamiltonian function and time dependent almost complex structure. Pick also a generic point  $\star$  in  $M$  to serve

---

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 57R17; 53D40, 14F35.

*Key words and phrases.* Symplectic topology, Fundamental group, Floer theory, Morse theory, Homotopy, Arnold conjecture.

as the base point. Recall the Floer trajectories in this setting are (finite energy) maps  $u : \mathbb{R} \times S^1 \rightarrow M$  satisfying the Floer equation :

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial s}(s, t) + J_t(u(s, t)) \frac{\partial u}{\partial t}(s, t) = J_t(u(s, t)) X_{H_t}(u(s, t)).$$

where  $X_H$  is the Hamiltonian vector field associated to  $H$ .

Using a cutoff function to turn off the non homogeneous Hamiltonian term on the positive end of the tube (resp. on both ends but preserving an annulus of varying modulus) allows to define moduli spaces of the form  $\mathcal{M}(x, \emptyset)$  (resp.  $\mathcal{M}(\star, \emptyset)$ ) whose connected components play the role of the unstable manifolds in Morse theory (see the comments after definition 2.4). This allows to define a notion of Floer loop (see definition 2.7), coming naturally with concatenation and cancellation rules that induce a group  $\mathcal{L}(H, \star)$ . The main statement of the paper is the following theorem :

**Theorem 1.1.** *There is a natural evaluation map that induces a surjective group morphism  $\mathcal{L}(H, J, \star) \twoheadrightarrow \pi_1(M, \star)$  .*

A description of the relations is also given, but, although they obviously only depend on  $H$ ,  $J$  and  $\star$ , we resort to an auxiliary Morse function to get a finite presentation for them (see section 4). Nevertheless, we produce explicit relations such that the generated normal subgroup  $\mathcal{R}(H, \star)$  satisfies the following statement :

**Theorem 1.2.** *The evaluation map induces a group isomorphism*

$$\mathcal{L}(H, \star) / \mathcal{R}(H, \star) \xrightarrow{\sim} \pi_1(M, \star) .$$

Notice the construction is presented here in the absolute setting, i.e. Hamiltonian fixed points problem, but also makes sens in the relative one, i.e. intersections of a Lagrangian sub-manifold with its deformations under Hamiltonian isotopies problem. Although the latter can be expected to hold the most interesting applications, we choose to focus on the former for the sake of simplicity and to better highlight the main ideas : the generalization to the latter entails exactly the same issues as for the homology and involves no new idea. Finally, the construction also makes sens in the stable Morse setting (i.e. study of Morse functions on  $M \times \mathbb{R}^N$  for arbitrary  $N$  that are quadratic at infinity). Although the corresponding results have their own interest in this setting and would deserve some discussion, they will not be developed in this paper.

The most immediate outcome of this construction regards estimates on the number of fixed points of Hamiltonian diffeomorphisms, but not in the most expected way.

Indeed, to one geometric periodic orbit  $x$  (with the suitable index), can correspond several Floer loop steps through this orbit. Counting the number of steps through a given orbit (or the base point) leads to a notion of

multiplicity  $\nu_J$  (that depends on the almost complex structure, see definition 2.9 for more details) and we have the following theorem :

**Theorem 1.3.** *Let  $\rho(\pi_1(M))$  denote the minimal number of generators of the fundamental group. Then :*

$$\nu_J(\star) + \sum_x \nu_J(x) \geq \delta(\pi_1(M))$$

where the sum runs over the contractible 1-periodic orbits (or more precisely over the homotopy classes of cappings of such orbits with Conley-Zehnder index  $1 - n$ ).

*Remark 1.* Notice a Morse theoretic analog of this notion of multiplicity can be given, but it always evaluates to 1 for index 1 critical points and to 0 for the base point : from this point of view, the above statement is an extension to the Floer setting of the well known fact that a non degenerate Morse function has to have sufficiently many index 1 critical points to generate the fundamental group.

*Remark 2.* This inequality is obviously different in nature from the Morse inequalities derived from the Floer homology, since one may have  $\rho(\pi_1(M)) > \beta_1(M)$  (where  $\beta_1(M)$  is the first Betti number of  $M$ ). It is also different from the results of K. Ono and A. Pajitnov ([12], see below) and more generally from any result based on the algebraic study of a chain complex that would also apply to the stable Morse setting, since stable Morse functions are known that have strictly less critical points than the minimal number of generators of the fundamental group.

Unfortunately, such situations are not very explicit. For instance, from [4], manifolds whose fundamental group is  $(A_5)^{20}$  do have stable Morse functions with strictly less critical points than Morse functions, but this comes from algebraic properties of the fundamental group rather than explicit examples. Nevertheless, it gives examples where the multiplicities (in the stable Morse setting which is not developed here) are mandatory and necessarily non trivial.

In our Floer setting, a situation where the multiplicities in (17) would be seen to be necessarily non trivial would be a counter example to the strong version of the Arnold conjecture (see below), and goes far beyond the scope of this paper. A weaker question would be to exhibit a situation where the multiplicities are non trivial, regardless of the total number of underlying geometric periodic orbits. Such situations are expected to be very common, but are necessarily very far from Morse situations and hence hard to produce explicitly (the situation is essentially the same as for the PSS morphism : index 0 Hamiltonian orbits may a priori be related to several index 0 Morse critical points and eventually through several trajectories, but exhibiting such a situation explicitly is not easy since it has to be far from the Morse case).

The role and the control of the contributions of the multiplicities in general is a deep and intriguing question. The following result offers a first and very basic constraint on the multiplicities, namely that  $\nu_J(\star)$  cannot be the only contribution :

**Theorem 1.4.** *Let  $(M, \omega)$  be a monotone symplectic manifold. Suppose  $\pi_1(M) \neq \{1\}$ . Then every non degenerate Hamiltonian function has to have at least one contractible 1-periodic orbit of Conley Zehnder index  $1 - n$ . Moreover, for a generic choice of eventually time dependent almost complex structure, at least one such orbit has non vanishing multiplicity.*

Although this result is far from optimal, and much more elaborated results in the direction of estimating the number of real periodic orbits appeared recently (see next paragraph), we find the proof worth mentioning since it is essentially geometric (instead of algebraic) and derives from the same idea that underlies the main construction, namely that 1 dimensional moduli spaces do contain information that the homology does not catch. Moreover, the orbit it exhibits has explicitly non vanishing multiplicity, which is strongly expected but not immediately obvious in other constructions.

**Relation to the Arnold conjecture and other results.** Theorem 1.3 is obviously a variation on the Arnold conjecture. In its non degenerate and strongest form, this conjecture claims that the total number of 1-periodic orbits of a non degenerate Hamiltonian flow can not be less than the minimal number of critical points for a Morse function (or stable Morse function in a weaker form of the conjecture).

This conjecture is closely related to the birth of symplectic geometry itself. A strong breakthrough was achieved by A. Floer who constructed his chain complex to establish the Homological version of the Arnold conjecture for compact monotone symplectic manifolds, opening the way to huge efforts by many authors to generalize his original construction and that we wont retrace here.

Until very recently however, all the work regarding this conjecture were focused on its homological version. While the strongest version, involving the Morse number (i.e. the minimal number of critical points for a Morse function), is still wide open and uncertain, the weaker version involving the *stable* Morse number, which is the minimal number of critical points for a Morse function on  $M \times \mathbb{R}^N$  (for arbitrary  $N$ ) that is quadratic at infinity, seems to be more robust and reachable.

The algebraic study of chain complexes done by V. V. Sharko [14], implies several constraints on the stable Morse number, and in [4], M. Damian shows that all the algebraic operations on the complex can be realized geometrically in the stable Morse setting. The lower bound for the stable Morse number is the minimal number  $\delta(\pi_1(M))$  of generators of the kernel of the augmentation  $\mathbb{Z}[\pi_1(M)] \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ , which may be strictly smaller than  $\rho(\pi_1(M))$ , and stable-Morse functions may indeed have strictly less critical points than regular Morse functions.

In a recent work [12], K. Ono and A. Pajitnov use the Floer complex with local coefficients to extend these constraints to the Hamiltonian setting. In particular, they show the following

**Theorem 1.5** (K. Ono, A. Pajitnov). *Suppose  $M$  is a weakly monotone symplectic manifold and let  $H$  be a Hamiltonian function on it. Then, if they are all non degenerate, the number  $p(H)$  of fixed points of the associated Hamiltonian diffeomorphism satisfies*

$$p(H) \geq \delta(\pi_1(M))$$

where  $\delta(\pi_1(M))$  is the minimal number of generators of the kernel of the augmentation  $\mathbb{Z}[\pi_1(M)] \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ .

The interpretation of the fundamental group proposed in this paper is different in nature from this results, and suggests an orthogonal point of view on this question : although there might not be enough periodic orbits to generate the fundamental group, it explains how a single orbit can define several generators to compensate this deficit.

**1.2. Organization of the paper.** In the second section of the paper (the first is this introduction), the main definitions, statements and technical tools are presented. The third section is dedicated to the comparison of Morse and Floer loops, and the proof of theorem 1.1. The fourth section is devoted to the description of the relations, and the fifth to the proof of the application (theorem 1.3) and theorem 1.4.

This work would not exist without the crucial help of a few people. I am particularly thankful to O. Cornea, whose deep topological insight and generosity nourished me for years, to J.-Y. Welschinger and B. Chantraine to whom I am indebted for the keystone of this paper, which is the notion of augmentation, to A. Oancea who served as a compass to me and to M. Damian who also owns a large part of this work. Finally, I'm particularly grateful to A.V. Duffrène who indirectly but deeply influenced the birth of this paper.

## 2. MAIN DEFINITIONS AND STATEMENTS.

**2.1. Preliminaries.** Let  $(M, \omega)$  be a  $2n$  dimensional connected compact symplectic manifold without boundary. For technical reasons,  $M$  will be supposed to be either

- aspherical, which means  $c_1(TM)$  and  $\omega$  vanish on the image of the Hurewicz morphism  $\pi_2(M) \rightarrow H_2(M)$ , or
- monotone, which means there is a positive constant  $\kappa$  such that  $c_1(TM) = \kappa[\omega]$  in  $H_2(M, \mathbb{R})$ .

These assumptions will allow us to easily

- avoid the transversality issues related to the multiply covered negative curves,

- avoid bubbles on 0 and 1 dimensional moduli spaces,
- ensure finiteness of the number of (lifted) orbits of given Conley-Zehnder index.

Given a Hamiltonian function  $H : M \times \mathbb{S}^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , we let  $X_H$  be the associated Hamiltonian vector field,  $\phi_H^t$  its flow, and  $\mathcal{P}(H)$  the set of its contractible 1-periodic orbits.

To handle the index computation when  $c_1(TM)$  does not vanish on  $\pi_2(M)$ , we consider the covering  $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}(H)$  associated to the group  $\pi_2(M)/\ker c_1$ . It is obtained from  $\mathcal{P}(H)$  by adjoining a class of capping to the orbit in the following way :

$$(1) \quad \tilde{\mathcal{P}}(H) = \{(\gamma, \bar{\gamma}), \gamma \in \mathcal{P}(H), \bar{\gamma} : D \rightarrow M, \bar{\gamma}|_{\partial D} = \gamma\} / \sim$$

where  $(\gamma, \bar{\gamma}) \sim (\gamma', \bar{\gamma}')$  if  $\gamma = \gamma'$  and  $\mu_{CZ}(\bar{\gamma}) = \mu_{CZ}(\bar{\gamma}')$  (which also means  $\omega(\bar{\gamma}) = \omega(\bar{\gamma}')$ , so that equivalence classes of cappings have a well defined index and symplectic area). In the sequel,  $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}(H)$  will completely replace  $\mathcal{P}(H)$  and no explicit reference to the covering will be made anymore. In particular, what we call a Hamiltonian orbit from now on will in fact be a lift of such an orbit to  $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}(H)$ .

Each element  $x$  in  $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}(H)$  then has a well defined Conley-Zehnder index  $\mu_{CZ}$ . For convenience, we shift the Conley-Zehnder index by  $n$  and let

$$|x| = \mu_{CZ}(x) + n.$$

The set of orbits  $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}(H)$  splits according to this index, and we let

$$\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_k(H) = \{x \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}(H), |x| = k\}.$$

Given an (eventually time dependent)  $\omega$  compatible almost complex structure  $J$ , we are interested in the Floer moduli spaces and some classical variants of such. Recall the Floer equation for a map  $u : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^1 \rightarrow M$  is the following :

$$(2) \quad \frac{\partial u}{\partial s} + J_t(u) \left( \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} - X_H(t, u) \right) = 0$$

Moreover, we fix once for all a smooth function  $\beta : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$  such that

$$\begin{cases} \beta(s) = 1 & \text{if } s \leq -1 \\ \beta(s) = 0 & \text{if } s \geq 0 \end{cases},$$

and use it to cutoff the Hamiltonian term of the Floer equation on one or both ends of the cylinder by considering the equation

$$(F_i) \quad \frac{\partial u}{\partial s} + J_{\chi_i(s)t}(u) \left( \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} - \chi_i(s) X_H(t, u) \right) = 0$$

for different functions  $\chi_i : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$  derived from  $\beta$ , namely (see figure1)

- (1)  $\chi_1 \equiv 1$  defines the usual Floer equation,
- (2)  $\chi_2(s) = \beta(s)$  defines the lower capping equation,
- (3)  $\chi_3(s) = \beta(-s)$  defines the upper capping equation,

(4)  $\chi_{4,R}(s) = \beta(s-R)\beta(-s-R)$  defines “ $R$ -perturbed” sphere equation.




FIGURE 1. Cutoff functions

In  $(F_{4,R})$ ,  $R$  is a real parameter, but notice that for  $R \leq 0$ , the equation has no Hamiltonian term anymore and does not depend on  $R$ :  $R$  will hence be considered in  $[0, +\infty)$ .

Recall that the energy of a solution  $u$  of this equation is defined as

$$E(u) = \iint \omega\left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial s}, \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} - \chi(s)X_H(u)\right)dsdt = \iint \left\|\frac{\partial u}{\partial s}\right\|_{\chi_i(s)t}^2 dsdt$$

where  $\|\cdot\|_t = \omega(\cdot, J_t \cdot)$ . Solutions of finite energy of this equation have converging ends, either to a point by the classical removal of singularities argument if the Hamiltonian term is cut off on this end, or to a Hamiltonian orbit if not. In the former case, considering the end as a neighborhood of 0 in  $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ , the map  $u$  extends holomorphically through 0, and the equations  $(F_i)$  above could equivalently be considered as defined on the sphere  $\mathbb{CP}^1$  with 2, 1 or no puncture (see for instance [11] for a more uniform description of these equation, or [10] chapter 8 for the case without punctures, i.e. equation  $(F_{4,R})$  with fixed  $R$ ). Anyway, on an end where the Hamiltonian term is cut off, the limit value will be denoted by  $u(+\infty)$  or  $u(-\infty)$ . We abusively but conveniently write that such a trajectory ends at the  $\emptyset$  symbol to describe the fact that this limit point is not constrained.

We are interested in the moduli spaces described below and depicted on figure 2. Let  $\star$  be a point in  $M$ , and  $\mathcal{U}$  be the space of (smooth, if  $J$  is smooth) maps  $u : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^1 \rightarrow M$  that have finite energy i.e. such that  $\iint \left\|\frac{\partial u}{\partial s}\right\|^2 dsdt < +\infty$ . If  $a$  is an oriented disc, let  $\bar{a}$  denote the disc with opposite orientation, and if  $b$  is another disc or tube having the same boundary as  $a$  with opposite orientation, let  $a\#b$  denote the gluing of the

two.

(3)

$$\mathring{\mathcal{M}}(y, x) = \{u \in \mathcal{U}, (F_1), \lim_{s \rightarrow \pm\infty} u(s, \cdot) = \begin{smallmatrix} x \\ y \end{smallmatrix}, \text{ and } [y\sharp u\sharp x] = 0\} / \mathbb{R}$$

(4)

$$\mathring{\mathcal{M}}(y, \emptyset) = \{u \in \mathcal{U}, (F_2), \lim_{s \rightarrow -\infty} u(s, \cdot) = y, \text{ and } [y\sharp u] = 0\}$$

(5)

$$\mathring{\mathcal{M}}(\star, x) = \{u \in \mathcal{U}, (F_3), \lim_{s \rightarrow \pm\infty} u(s, \cdot) = \begin{smallmatrix} y \\ \star \end{smallmatrix} \text{ and } [u\sharp x] = 0\}$$

(6)

$$\mathring{\mathcal{M}}(\star, \emptyset) = \{(R, u) \in [0, +\infty) \times \mathcal{U}, (F_{4,R}), \lim_{s \rightarrow +\infty} u(s, \cdot) = \star \text{ and } [u] = 0\}$$

where the brackets denote classes in  $\pi_2(M)/\ker c_1$ , and their vanishing express the compatibility of the trajectory  $u$  with the prescribed lifts of its ends to the covering space  $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}(H)$ .

Notice that in the last case, the  $R$  parameter is allowed to vary, and that the moduli space  $\mathring{\mathcal{M}}(\star, \emptyset)$  is endowed with the map  $\mathring{\mathcal{M}}(\star, \emptyset) \xrightarrow{\pi} [0, +\infty)$  given by  $\pi(u, R) = R$ .




FIGURE 2. Floer moduli spaces.

Since the elements of  $\mathring{\mathcal{M}}(x, \emptyset)$  for  $x \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_0(H)$  are generally used to define an augmentation on the Floer homology, we use the following terminology :

**Definition 2.1.** *Given an index 0 Hamiltonian periodic orbit  $x \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_0(H)$ , a capping  $\alpha \in \mathcal{M}(x, \emptyset)$  is called an “augmentation” of  $x$ , and the couple  $(x, \alpha)$  an augmented orbit.*

It is well known ([8],[10]) that for a generic choice of  $(H, J)$ , moduli spaces of the first type are smooth manifolds whose dimension is prescribed by the index of the ends. The three other types of moduli spaces are used in [13] (in conjunction with a Morse function that we do not use here) to define the PSS morphisms and compare Morse and Floer homology. Their regularity



under a generic choice of the triple  $(H, J, \star)$  follows from similar arguments to the first one.

*Remark 3.* The last moduli space  $\mathring{\mathcal{M}}(\star, \emptyset)$  is somewhat special with this respect since for  $R = 0$ , it involves constant maps, for which the key argument of being “somewhere injective” fails. However, the following proposition ensures that constant spheres are indeed regular.

*Proposition 2.2.* Recall the projection  $\mathring{\mathcal{M}}(\star, \emptyset) \xrightarrow{\pi} [0, +\infty)$ . For  $R = 0$ ,  $\pi^{-1}(R)$  consists in the single point  $(u_\star, 0)$  where  $u_\star$  is the constant map at  $\star$ . Moreover, this solution is regular, which means that (in the suitable functional spaces) the equation defining the moduli space  $\mathcal{M}(\star, \emptyset)$  is a submersion at this point.

*Sketch of proof.* Glossing over the definition of the functional spaces in use, observe that the problem can be reformulated in terms of maps from  $\mathbb{CP}^1$  to  $M$  in the trivial homology class. For  $R = 0$ , equation  $(F_{4,R})$  simply becomes

$$(7) \quad Du + J_0(u) Du i = 0$$

Points of  $\mathcal{M}(\star, \emptyset)$  lying above  $R = 0$  are hence  $J_0$ -holomorphic spheres in the trivial homology class and are therefore constant. The additional condition  $u(0) = \star$  implies  $\pi^{-1}(0) = \{(u_\star, 0)\}$ .

The linearization (with respect to  $u$ ) of the left hand term in (7) at the constant map  $u_\star$  leads to a linear operators  $L$  defined for maps from  $\mathbb{CP}^1$  to a fixed  $\mathbb{C}^n = T_\star M$  of the form

$$(8) \quad L\dot{u} = D\dot{u} + J_0 D\dot{u} i$$

where  $J_0 = J_0(\star)$  is constant. The kernel of  $L$  consists of the holomorphic spheres in  $\mathbb{C}^n$  and hence of the constants. It is therefore  $2n$  dimensional and since  $2n$  is also the index of  $L$ , this implies that  $L$  is surjective, which easily implies the required submersion property.  $\square$

In particular, under a generic choice of  $(H, J, \star)$ , we have :

$$\begin{aligned} \dim \mathring{\mathcal{M}}(y, x) &= |y| - |x| - 1 \\ \dim \mathring{\mathcal{M}}(y, \emptyset) &= |y| \\ \dim \mathring{\mathcal{M}}(\star, x) &= -|x| \\ \dim \mathring{\mathcal{M}}(\star, \emptyset) &= 1 \end{aligned}$$

From now on,  $(H, J, \star)$  will be supposed to be chosen so that all these moduli spaces are indeed defined transversely.

Moreover, all these moduli spaces are compact up to breaks or bubbling off, and we let

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{M}(x, y) &= \overline{\overset{\circ}{\mathcal{M}}(x, y)} & \mathcal{M}(x, \emptyset) &= \overline{\overset{\circ}{\mathcal{M}}(x, \emptyset)} \\ \mathcal{M}(\star, y) &= \overline{\overset{\circ}{\mathcal{M}}(\star, y)} & \mathcal{M}(\star, \emptyset) &= \overline{\overset{\circ}{\mathcal{M}}(\star, \emptyset)}\end{aligned}$$

be the Gromov-Floer compactifications of the previous moduli spaces.

*Remark 4.* Notice however that  $\mathcal{M}(\star, \emptyset)$  has a “built-in” (i.e. already present in  $\overset{\circ}{\mathcal{M}}(\star, \emptyset)$ ) boundary component, , that does not come from the Gromov compactification but from the limit case  $R = 0$ .

In all this paper, only 0 and 1 dimensional moduli spaces will be considered, and no bubbling of sphere can occur on such moduli spaces. This means they will all be compact up to breaks.

In particular, each 0 dimensional moduli space  $\mathcal{M}(y, x)$  is compact, and hence finite, and we let

$$\sharp_{\text{abs}}(\mathcal{M}(y, x)) = \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{M}(y, x)} (+1)$$

denote the (absolute) number of elements in  $\mathcal{M}(y, x)$ .

*Remark 5.* It is usual, when working with pseudo-holomorphic curves or Floer trajectories, to consider the algebraic number  $\sharp_{\text{alg}} \mathcal{M}(x, y)$  of elements in a 0-dimensional moduli space, i.e. to take signs coming from some orientation of the moduli space into account. We stress however that this definition refers to the absolute number, i.e. the sum where each element counts for +1.

**2.2. Floer steps and loops.** Given a configuration of two consecutive isolated Floer “trajectories”  $(\beta, \alpha) \in \mathcal{M}(y, x) \times \mathcal{M}(x, \emptyset)$  with  $x \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_0(H)$  and  $y \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_1(H) \cup \{\star\}$ , the gluing construction ([8], [10]) gives rise to a one dimensional family of trajectories starting with  $(\beta, \alpha)$  and ending at some other broken configuration  $(\beta', \alpha') \in \mathcal{M}(y, x') \times \mathcal{M}(x', \emptyset)$ . This relation between  $(\beta, \alpha)$  and  $(\beta', \alpha')$  will be denoted by

$$(9) \quad (\beta, \alpha) \overset{\sharp}{\leftrightarrow} (\beta', \alpha').$$

*Remark 6.* Recall the gluing construction defines an homeomorphism between a neighborhood of the broken configuration  $(\alpha, \beta)$  in the compactified moduli space  $\mathcal{M}(y, \emptyset)$  and  $\{(\beta, \alpha)\} \times [0, \epsilon)$  for some  $\epsilon > 0$ . In particular, this proves the compactification is a segment and not a circle, and hence that relation (9) necessarily implies that  $(\beta, \alpha) \neq (\beta', \alpha')$ .

This “move” from one end of a moduli space to another described above in  $\mathcal{M}(y, \emptyset)$  makes sens for all kinds of configurations, and will be the main ingredient of all the subsequent constructions. It therefore deserves a general definition :

**Definition 2.3.** *A Floer step is an oriented connected component with non empty boundary of a 1 dimensional moduli space.*

*Remark 7.* In particular, the same component defines two steps with opposite orientations.

Depending on the type of moduli space under consideration, there are several types of Floer steps. Floer loops will be built out of special steps, called *Floer loop steps*, which are depicted on figure 3 and specified in the following definition :

**Definition 2.4.** *A Floer loop step is a Floer step in some  $\mathcal{M}(y, \emptyset)$  for  $y \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_1(H)$  or in  $\mathcal{M}(\star, \emptyset)$ .*

This somewhat abstruse definition is the heart of the construction and deserves some comments.

An enlightening point of view is the Morse theory. Consider a function  $f$  and a Riemannian metric  $g$  on  $M$  such that the pair  $(f, g)$  is Morse-Smale. Any generic loop in the manifold is pushed down by the flow of  $f$  to a concatenation of paths defined by the unstable manifolds of index 1 critical points. We call such a path travelling along the unstable manifold of an index 1 critical points a “Morse loop step”.

It turns out that such a path can be interpreted from the moduli space point of view : let  $y$  be an index 1 critical point and  $W^u(y)$  its unstable manifold. A point  $p$  in the unstable manifold defines a path, namely the piece of Morse trajectory from  $y$  to  $p$ , and there is a one to one correspondence between such trajectory pieces and the unstable manifold (see [2] for a detailed presentation of this point of view, and a nice compactification of the unstable manifold derived from it). More precisely, define an “interrupted” Morse trajectory as a solution of the following modified Morse equation

$$(10) \quad \frac{d\gamma}{ds} = -\chi(s)\nabla f(\gamma(s))$$

where the cutoff function  $\chi$  is the same as the one used in  $(F_2)$ , i.e. a smooth decreasing function such that  $\chi(s) = 1$  for  $s \leq -1$  and  $\chi(s) = 0$  for  $s \geq 0$ .

Using the same notation as in the Floer setting, let

$$(11) \quad \mathring{\mathcal{M}}_{\text{Morse}}(y, \emptyset) = \{\gamma : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow M, (10) \text{ and } \lim_{s \rightarrow -\infty} \gamma(s) = y\}.$$

This space is naturally endowed with an evaluation map (recall the trajectories are constant for  $s \geq 0$  so  $\gamma(+\infty) = \gamma(0)$ ) :

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathring{\mathcal{M}}_{\text{Morse}}(y, \emptyset) & \rightarrow & W^u(y) \subset M \\ \gamma & \mapsto & \gamma(+\infty) \end{array}$$

which is one to one and provides an identification between  $\mathring{\mathcal{M}}_{\text{Morse}}(y, \emptyset)$  and  $W^u(y)$ .

Moreover,  $\overset{\circ}{\mathcal{M}}_{\text{Morse}}(y, \emptyset)$  has a natural compactification  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{Morse}}(y, \emptyset)$  as a 1 dimensional segment whose ends are the two broken configurations  $(\gamma_{\pm}, \bar{x}_{\pm})$  where

- $\gamma_+$  and  $\gamma_-$  are the two Morse trajectories rooted at  $y$ ,
- $x_{\pm}$  is an index 0 critical point such that  $x_{\pm} = \lim_{s \rightarrow +\infty} \gamma_{\pm}$ ,
- $\bar{x}_{\pm}$  is the constant solution of (10) at  $x_{\pm}$ .

The evaluation map extends to this compactification and defines a path running along  $W^u(y)$  from  $x_-$  to  $x_+$ , which is the “Morse loop step” associated to  $y$ .

From this point of view, a Floer loop step through index an 1 periodic orbit is the exact analog of a Morse loop step through index 1 critical point.

*Remark 8.* One noticeable difference between the Morse and Floer setting however, is that the Floer moduli space  $\mathcal{M}(y, \emptyset)$  need not be connected : each connected component can be interpreted as different “Floer unstable manifold” of the orbit  $y$ , which hence has to be considered as as many virtually distinct orbits.

*Remark 9.* For orbits  $y$  of higher index, the components of the moduli space  $\mathcal{M}(y, \emptyset)$  can still be regarded as “Floer unstable manifolds” of  $y$ . However, unlike the Morse unstable manifolds, there is no control a priori on the topology of such a space : it need not be connected, nor need the connected components be balls.

Similarly, assuming by genericity that  $\star$  is not critical for  $f$ , the Morse analog of the space  $\mathcal{M}(\star, \emptyset)$  is the collection of segments of the (unique) trajectory passing through  $\star$ , running from  $\star$  down to some arbitrary point  $p$  below it along this trajectory. It is in one to one correspondence with (the closure of) the piece of trajectory flowing from  $\star$  down to the index 0 critical point below it.





FIGURE 3. The three kinds of Floer loop steps.

Definitions 2.3 and 2.4 are not very explicit and a more usable description of a step is obtained by specifying its ends :

FIGURE 4. The moduli space  $\mathcal{M}(\star, \emptyset)$ .

**Proposition 2.5.** *For  $y \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_1(H)$ , a Floer loop step through  $y$  is characterized by a quadruple  $(\alpha, \beta, \beta', \alpha')$  with  $\alpha \in \mathcal{M}(x, \emptyset)$ ,  $\beta \in \mathcal{M}(y, x)$ ,  $\beta' \in \mathcal{M}(y, x')$ , and  $\alpha' \in \mathcal{M}(x', \emptyset)$  for some  $x, x' \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_0(H)$  such that*

$$(\beta, \alpha) \overset{\#}{\leftrightarrow} (\beta', \alpha').$$

The situation of Floer loop steps through  $\star$  is slightly different, as there is one special step that does not look like the others.

Recall that the moduli space  $\mathring{\mathcal{M}}(\star, \emptyset)$  comes with a projection to the non negative reals

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathring{\mathcal{M}}(\star, \emptyset) & \xrightarrow{\pi} & [0, +\infty) \\ (R, u) & \mapsto & R \end{array}.$$

This projection is proper, and extends continuously to a map  $\mathcal{M}(\star, \emptyset) \xrightarrow{\pi} [0, +\infty]$  where all the broken configurations lie above  $R = +\infty$ . Moreover, the gluing construction ensures that exactly one component of  $\mathcal{M}(\star, \emptyset)$  ends at each broken configuration.

Observe now that the same holds over  $R = 0$  : exactly one component of  $\mathcal{M}(\star, \emptyset)$  ends at the constant map  $(u_\star, 0)$ . This is a direct consequence of the regularity of this solution stressed in proposition 2.2 (surjectivity of  $L$  implies that  $\pi : \mathcal{M}(\star, \emptyset) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a submersion at  $(u_\star, 0)$ ).

As a consequence,  $\mathcal{M}(\star, \emptyset)$  has exactly one connected component that relates  $\{\star\}$  to a broken configuration, and all the other components either have no boundary or relate two broken configurations :

$$(12) \quad \exists! x_\star \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_0(H), \exists! (\beta_\star, \alpha_\star) \in \mathcal{M}(\star, x_\star) \times \mathcal{M}(x_\star, \emptyset), \quad (\beta_\star, \alpha_\star) \overset{\#}{\leftrightarrow} \star$$

**Proposition 2.6.** *There is one orbit  $x_\star \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_0(H)$  and one couple  $(\beta_\star, \alpha_\star) \in \mathcal{M}(\star, x_\star) \times \mathcal{M}(x_\star, \emptyset)$  such that a Floer loop step through  $\star$  is*

- either the special step  $\star \overset{\#}{\leftrightarrow} (\beta_\star, \alpha_\star)$
- or characterized by a quadruple  $(\alpha, \beta, \beta', \alpha')$  with  $\alpha \in \mathcal{M}(x, \emptyset)$ ,  $\beta \in \mathcal{M}(\star, x)$ ,  $\beta' \in \mathcal{M}(\star, x')$ , and  $\alpha' \in \mathcal{M}(x', \emptyset)$  for some  $x, x' \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_0(H)$  such that

$$(\beta, \alpha) \overset{\#}{\leftrightarrow} (\beta', \alpha').$$

*Remark 10.* Considering loop steps entering the second case in the above statement might seem unnatural since, as already mentioned, in the Morse setting, only the special step  $\star \overset{\#}{\leftrightarrow} (\beta_\star, \alpha_\star)$  does exists. In the Floer context however (as well as in the stable Morse setting where explicit examples can be given), such steps might exist, and have to be taken into account.

*Remark 11.* Notice there are only finitely many Floer loop steps : there are finitely many periodic orbits, and because of the monotonicity assumption, finitely many lifts of each can have index 0 or 1, and finally, each 0 dimensional moduli space is compact and hence finite.

Notice finally that Floer loop steps are oriented : with the notations of propositions 2.5 and 2.6,  $\alpha$  is the start of the step and  $\alpha'$  its end. Two loop steps are said to be consecutive if the end of the first is the start of the second.




FIGURE 5. A Floer based loop.

**Definition 2.7.** A Floer based loop is a sequence of consecutive Floer loop steps starting and ending at  $\star$ .

In other words, a Floer based loop is a sequence

$$(\star, \beta_\star, \alpha_\star)(\alpha_\star, \beta_1, \beta_1', \alpha_2), (\alpha_2, \beta_2, \beta_2', \alpha_3), \dots, (\alpha_N, \beta_N, \beta_N', \alpha_\star)(\alpha_\star, \beta_\star, \star)$$

such that (letting  $\alpha_1 = \alpha_{N+1} = \alpha_\star$ ) :

$$\forall i \in \{1, \dots, N+1\}, \quad (\beta_i, \alpha_i') \overset{\#}{\leftrightarrow} (\beta_i', \alpha_{i+1}),$$

Let  $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(H, \star)$  be the set of all Floer based loops. Notice it depends on all the auxiliary data  $(H, \star, J)$  but the dependency on  $J$  is kept implicit to reduce the notation. It carries an obvious concatenation rule that turns it into a semi-group.

It also carries obvious cancellation rules. More explicitly, if  $\sigma = (\alpha, \beta, \beta', \alpha')$  is a Floer loop step, define its inverse  $\sigma^{-1}$  to be the same step with the opposite orientation :

$$\sigma^{-1} = (\alpha', \beta', \beta, \alpha).$$

Denote by  $\sim$  the associated cancellation rules in  $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(H, \star)$  :

$$\sigma_1 \dots \sigma_i \sigma_i^{-1} \dots \sigma_N \sim \sigma_1 \dots \sigma_{i-1} \sigma_{i+1} \dots \sigma_N.$$

The concatenation then endows the quotient space

$$(13) \quad \mathcal{L}(H, \star) = \tilde{\mathcal{L}}(H, \star) / \sim.$$

with a group structure.

A Floer loop step being a one parameter family of tubes, evaluation at the  $+\infty$  end of the tube defines a path in  $M$  (an arbitrary parameterization can be chosen for each step, since we are only interested in the resulting homotopy class), and induces a map

$$(14) \quad \tilde{\mathcal{L}}(H, \star) \xrightarrow{\text{ev}} \pi_1(M, \star).$$

This map is compatible with both the concatenation and the cancellation rules and hence induces a group morphism

$$(15) \quad \mathcal{L}(H, \star) \xrightarrow{\text{ev}} \pi_1(M, \star),$$

All the objects involved in theorem 1.1 are now defined and we recall its statement :

**Theorem 2.8.** *With the above notations, the evaluation map induces a surjective morphism*

$$(16) \quad \mathcal{L}(H, \star) \xrightarrow{\text{ev}} \pi_1(M, \star).$$

The description of the relations still requires the introduction of the main technical ingredient of the construction, and we postpone it to section 4 to focus in the next section on the application to the count, with multiplicity, of Hamiltonian periodic orbits, since it only requires the surjectivity.

### 2.3. Application.

**Definition 2.9.** *Define the multiplicity of a Hamiltonian orbit  $y \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_1(H)$  as the number of steps through it, i.e.*

$$\nu_J(y) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{x \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_0(H)} \#_{\text{abs}} \mathcal{M}(y, x) \cdot \#_{\text{abs}} \mathcal{M}(x, \emptyset)$$

*Define the multiplicity of the point  $\star$  as the number*

$$\nu_J(\star) = \frac{1}{2} \left( \sum_{x \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_0(H)} \#_{\text{abs}} \mathcal{M}(\star, x) \cdot \#_{\text{abs}} \mathcal{M}(x, \emptyset) \right) - \frac{1}{2}$$

Notice the counting here is not algebraic but geometric : it is not hard to see that the algebraic count would always be 0.

Although they may seem to be  $\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}$  valued, these numbers are in fact integer valued : as already observed, the gluing construction groups the broken trajectory  $(\beta, \alpha)$  from some  $y \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_1(H)$  to  $\emptyset$  by pairs, so there is an

even number of such, and the same holds for broken trajectories from  $\star$  to  $\emptyset$  but for  $(\beta_\star, \alpha_\star)$ , which proves there is an odd number of such in this case.

*Remark 12.* Recall from (11) that all the involved moduli spaces, and hence the notion of multiplicity itself, make sens in the Morse setting. However, the Morse situation is much more constrained, and we know there are exactly two trajectories rooted at each index 1 critical point, and exactly one through  $\star$  : this implies that in the Morse setting, the multiplicity is always 1 for index 1 critical points and 0 for  $\star$ .

The following statement is a reformulation of theorem 1.3 and is a direct corollary of our construction. It will be proven in section 5.1.

**Theorem 2.10.** *Let  $\rho(\pi_1(M))$  be the minimal number of elements in a generating family of  $\pi_1(M)$ . Then*

$$(17) \quad \nu_J(\star) + \sum_{y \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_1(H)} \nu_J(y) \geq \rho(\pi_1(M)).$$

*In other words, counted with multiplicities,  $\{\star\} \cup \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_1(H)$  contains sufficiently many elements to generate  $\pi_1(M)$ .*

*Remark 13.* According to remark 12, the left hand side in (17) in the Morse setting is exactly the number of index 1 critical points, so that in this setting the inequality (17) is nothing but the usual lower estimate of the number of index 1 critical points of a Morse function by the minimal number of generators of the fundamental group  $\pi_1(M)$ .

*Remark 14.* Although the natural interpretation of the  $\nu_J(\star)$  term is a multiplicity for  $\star$ , it is expressed as contributions of index 0 orbits, namely  $\frac{1}{2} \sharp_{\text{abs}} \mathcal{M}(\star, x) \cdot \sharp_{\text{abs}} \mathcal{M}(x, \emptyset)$  for each  $x \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_0(H)$ . The left hand side of inequality (17) can hence be expressed as a sum of contributions of index 0 and 1 Hamiltonian periodic orbits.

*Remark 15.* The  $\nu_J(\star)$  term in (17) may be unexpected, since it automatically vanishes in the Morse setting. It is a very natural question to ask how essential it is and if it can be controlled. The results of K. Ono and A. Pajitnov prove there are always at least enough index 1 orbits to generate the kernel of the augmentation morphism. Although the multiplicities of the orbits detected in this way still have to be investigated, it is a strong indication that the contribution of the index 1 orbits to the left hand term of (17) cannot be arbitrarily small.

The weaker theorem 1.4, which is precised below and proven in section 5.2 ensures that when  $\pi_1(M) \neq \{1\}$ , this contribution of the index 1 orbits is at least 1, since it provides such an orbit with non vanishing multiplicity.

Although it is far from optimal, we still state it because its proof is simple and geometric and might be of independent interest. It is a variation, in the usual context of PSS moduli spaces, on the main guiding principle of this paper of using 1-dimensional moduli spaces to catch extra information.



We stress however that it is not an application of the construction of the fundamental group, but an illustration that the multiplicities cannot be arbitrary.

**Theorem 2.11.** *Suppose  $\pi_1(M) \neq \{1\}$ . Let  $H$  be a non degenerate Hamiltonian function and  $J$  a generic choice of a time dependant almost complex structure  $J$  compatible with  $\omega$ .*

*Then  $H$  has at least one contractible 1-periodic orbit with Conley-Zehnder index  $1 - n$  and with non vanishing multiplicity with respect to  $J$ .*

## 2.4. More notations and tools.

2.4.1. *Mixed moduli spaces.* In addition to the already introduced moduli spaces we will need hybrid Morse-Floer moduli spaces, depicted in figure 6 and defined below.




FIGURE 6. Hybrid moduli spaces.

Let  $f$  be a Morse functions and  $g$  a Riemannian metric on  $M$ . Let  $\text{Crit}_k(f)$  be the set of index  $k$  critical points, and suppose  $\text{Crit}_0(f) = \{\star\}$ . For  $y \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_1(H)$  and  $a \in \text{Crit}(f)$ , we let

$$\mathring{\mathcal{M}}(y, a) = \{u \in \mathcal{M}(y, \emptyset), u(+\infty) \in W^s(a)\}$$

where  $W^s(a)$  is the stable manifold of  $a$ .

Similarly, for  $b \in \text{Crit}_1(f)$  and  $x \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_0(H)$ , we let

$$\mathring{\mathcal{M}}(b, x) = \{u \in \mathcal{M}(\emptyset, x), u(-\infty) \in W^u(b)\}$$

where  $W^u(b)$  is the unstable manifold of  $b$ .

These spaces are compact up to bubbling of spheres and breaks, either at an intermediate Hamiltonian orbit or at an intermediate Morse critical point (see [13]), and the compactifications are denoted by  $\mathcal{M}(y, a)$  and  $\mathcal{M}(b, x)$ . Moreover,  $(f, g)$  is supposed to be chosen generically, so that all these spaces are cut out transversely. In particular, they have the expected dimensions :

$$\dim \mathcal{M}(y, a) = |y| - |a| \quad \dim \mathcal{M}(b, x) = |b| - |x|$$

(where the Morse index is also denoted by  $|\cdot|$ ) and there is a gluing construction proving every broken configuration does indeed appear on the boundary of a bigger moduli space.

2.4.2. *Crocodile walk.* We now introduce the main technical tool.

Consider a Hamiltonian orbit  $z$  of index 2. Let  $B(z)$  be the space of twice broken trajectories from  $z$  to  $\emptyset$  :

$$B(z) = \bigcup_{\substack{|y|=1 \\ |x|=0}} \mathcal{M}(z, y) \times \mathcal{M}(y, x) \times \mathcal{M}(x, \emptyset).$$

For each such trajectory, the gluing construction can take place either at the upper or lower break. Gluing at the upper break defines an involution

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \#^\bullet B(z) & \rightarrow & B(z) \\ (\gamma, \beta, \alpha) & \mapsto & (\gamma', \beta', \alpha) \end{array}$$

where  $(\gamma', \beta')$  is such that  $(\gamma, \beta) \xleftrightarrow{\#} (\gamma', \beta')$ . Similarly, gluing at the lower break, defines another involution

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \#_\bullet B(z) & \rightarrow & B(z) \\ (\gamma, \beta, \alpha) & \mapsto & (\gamma, \beta', \alpha') \end{array}$$

According to definition 2.3, upper and lower gluings are both Floer steps, and lower gluings are Floer loop steps.

Iteration of alternately upper and lower gluings then naturally appears as a walk on the space of twice broken trajectories. Moreover, since the intermediate Floer trajectory form a zigzag pattern (see figure 7), we use the following vocabulary :

**Definition 2.12.** *Iteration of alternately upper and lower gluings  $\#_\bullet \circ \#^\bullet \circ \#_\bullet \circ \#^\bullet \circ \dots$  will be abbreviated as running a “crocodile walk” on the set  $B(z)$  of twice broken trajectories from  $z$  to  $\emptyset$ .*

*Remark 16.* Given a twice broken configuration, the crocodile walk can be started with an upper or a lower gluing : because  $\#^\bullet$  and  $\#_\bullet$  are involutions, this only affects the walking direction along the orbit, but not the underlying non-oriented orbit. We consider orbits as oriented however, so through one configuration go exactly two orbits of the crocodile walk, which differ only by the orientation.

**Proposition 2.13.** *From a more geometric point of view, an orbit of the crocodile walk is a boundary component “containing corners” of a two dimensional moduli space  $(\mathcal{M}(z, \emptyset)$  in the above setting), and the crocodile walk itself is nothing but moving from one corner to the other along this 1-dimensional boundary component.*

*Proof.* In fact, recall the gluing construction provides a local homeomorphism between the moduli space near a twice broken configuration and  $[0, \epsilon)^2$ . Gluing one of the two breaks preserving the other consists precisely in moving along one or the other side of this corner.  $\square$

*Remark 17.* Crocodile walks can in fact be defined much more generally on any kind of 0 dimensional moduli space of twice broken configurations, like

the space of twice broken Floer trajectories between orbits of relative index 3 for instance, or hybrid moduli spaces mixing Floer and Morse trajectories as in the next paragraph.

The crocodile walk is the iteration of a one to one map  $(\sharp \bullet \circ \sharp \bullet)$  on a finite set, so the orbits all have to be cyclic.

Moreover, if a configuration is reached after an upper (resp. lower) gluing, it has to be left with a lower (resp. upper) one. As a consequence, to be cyclic, an orbit has to contain the same number of upper and lower gluings. In particular, it counts an even number of steps.

To an orbit of the crocodile walk is not only associated a sequence of twice broken trajectories, but also an abstract polyhedron representing the way the trajectories in the different moduli spaces fit together.




FIGURE 7. An orbit of the crocodile walk on the space of twice broken trajectories from  $z \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_2(H)$  to  $\emptyset$ .

An orbit  $W$  of the crocodile walk is a sequence

$$((\gamma_1, \beta_1, \alpha_1), (\gamma_2, \beta'_1, \alpha_1), (\gamma_2, \beta_2, \alpha_2), \dots, (\gamma_N, \beta_N, \alpha_N))$$

such that

$$(\gamma_k, \beta_k) \xleftrightarrow{\sharp} (\gamma_{k+1}, \beta'_k) \quad \text{and} \quad (\beta'_k, \alpha_k) \xleftrightarrow{\sharp} (\beta_{k+1}, \alpha_{k+1}).$$

**Lemma 2.14.** *Let  $W$  be an orbit of the crocodile walk like above. There exists an abstract disc  $\Delta(W)$  endowed with a continuous map  $\Delta(W) \xrightarrow{\text{ev}} M$  whose restriction to the boundary is the concatenation of evaluation of the Floer steps  $(\beta'_1, \alpha_1) \xleftrightarrow{\sharp} (\beta_2, \alpha_2), \dots, (\beta'_{N-1}, \alpha_{N-1}) \xleftrightarrow{\sharp} (\beta_N, \alpha_N)$*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{M}_k^\bullet$  (resp.  $\mathcal{M}_{\bullet k}$ ) be an abstract copy of the component of the moduli space relating  $(\gamma_k, \beta_k)$  to  $(\gamma_{k+1}, \beta'_k)$  (resp.  $(\beta'_k, \alpha_k)$  to  $(\beta_{k+1}, \alpha_{k+1})$ ). Let  $\Sigma \mathcal{M}_k^\bullet$  be its suspension : it is the suspension of a segment and hence can be identified with the standard diamond.

Recall that before compactification, the evaluation along the real line defines a map

$$\mathcal{M}_k^\bullet \times \mathbb{R} \xrightarrow{\text{ev}} \mathcal{M}.$$

Since the action is strictly decreasing along the Floer trajectories, it can be used to define a parameterization of the trajectories, and to define a continuous map

$$\overset{\circ}{\mathcal{M}}_k^\bullet \times [-1, 1] \xrightarrow{\text{ev}} \mathcal{M}.$$

that extends continuously to the compactification, and descends to the suspension

$$\Sigma \mathcal{M}_k^\bullet \xrightarrow{\text{ev}} \mathcal{M}.$$




FIGURE 8. Steps suspensions.

We think of  $\Sigma \mathcal{M}_k^\bullet$  as a diamond (see figure 8), and on the four sides, the evaluation map is the action-normalized evaluation along the broken trajectories  $(\gamma_k, \beta_k)$  on the left and  $(\gamma_{k+1}, \beta'_k)$  on the right.

A similar construction can also be achieved for the  $\mathcal{M}_{\bullet k}$  spaces. The lower end of the trajectories is not constrained however, and the suspension should be replaced by the half suspension  $\Sigma' \mathcal{M}_{\bullet k} = \mathcal{M}_{\bullet k} \times [-1, 1] \setminus \mathcal{M}_{\bullet k} \times \{1\}$ . We think of this as a truncated diamond, or a pentagon (see figure 8). It is endowed with an evaluation map whose restriction


- to the upper left side (i.e.  $[0, 1] \times \{(\beta'_k, \alpha_k)\}$ ) is  $\beta'_k$
- to the lower left side (i.e.  $[-1, 0] \times \{(\beta'_k, \alpha_k)\}$ ) is  $\alpha_k$
- to the upper right side (i.e.  $[0, 1] \times \{(\beta_{k+1}, \alpha_{k+1})\}$ ) is  $\beta_{k+1}$
- to the lower right side (i.e.  $[-1, 0] \times \{(\beta_{k+1}, \alpha_{k+1})\}$ ) is  $\alpha_{k+1}$
- to the bottom side (i.e.  $\{-1\} \times \mathcal{M}_{\bullet k}$ ) is the evaluation at the center of the augmentations  $\text{ev}(u) = u(+\infty)$

We identify all these diamonds and pentagons along their shared sides in the order of the gluings appearing in the orbit  $W$  (see figure 9). Formally, we let

$$(18) \quad \Delta(W) = \left( \bigsqcup_{k=1}^N \Sigma \mathcal{M}_k^\bullet \sqcup \Sigma' \mathcal{M}_{\bullet k} \right) / \sim$$

where  $\sim$  is the identification, for each  $k$  of

- the upper right side of  $\Sigma \mathcal{M}_k^\bullet$  with the upper left side of  $\Sigma \mathcal{M}_{k+1}^\bullet$ ,
- the lower right side of  $\Sigma \mathcal{M}_k^\bullet$  with the upper left side of  $\Sigma \mathcal{M}_{\bullet k+1}$ .
- the lower left side of  $\Sigma \mathcal{M}_{k+1}^\bullet$  with the upper right side of  $\Sigma \mathcal{M}_{\bullet k+1}$ .

FIGURE 9. The disc  $\Delta(W)$ .

The resulting 2 dimensional polyhedron  $\Delta(W)$  is a disc. Moreover, since it is compatible with all the identifications, the evaluation map descends to  $\Delta(W)$  and defines a continuous map

$$(19) \quad \Delta(W) \xrightarrow{\text{ev}} M.$$

and has the desired behaviour on the boundary.  $\square$

*Remark 18.* Reversing the orientation of  $W$  reverses the orientation of the associated disc.

*Remark 19.* Regarding the crocodile walk orbit  $W$  as a boundary component of a 2 dimensional moduli space, the disc  $\Delta(W)$  is essentially the same as the half suspension of this boundary component.

This geometric point of view does not avoid the above description however, since the structure of the disc and in particular the behavior of the evaluation on its boundary is crucial to our construction.

**2.4.3. Hybrid walks.** As already observed, the “crocodile walk” can in fact be run on many kinds of moduli spaces, in particular on a hybrid moduli space mixing Morse trajectories rooted at an index 1 critical point of our Morse function  $f$  and Floer tubes.

Let  $b \in \text{Crit}_1(f)$ , let  $\{\gamma_-, \gamma_+\} = \mathcal{M}(b, \star)$  be the two Morse trajectories rooted at  $b$  (recall  $\text{Crit}_0(f) = \{\star\}$ ). Let

$$B(b) = \bigcup_{y \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_1(H) \cup \{\star\}} \mathcal{M}(b, y) \times \partial \mathcal{M}(y, \emptyset)$$

This space plays the role of twice broken trajectories, but as already observed, the space  $\partial \mathcal{M}(\star, \emptyset)$  has one (and only one) point which is not a break :  $B(b)$  splits as the union  $B(b) = B'(b) \cup B_\star(b)$  of the set of twice

broken trajectories

$$B'(b) = \bigcup_{\substack{y \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_1(H) \cup \{\star\} \\ x \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_0(H)}} \mathcal{M}(b, y) \times \mathcal{M}(y, x) \times \mathcal{M}(x, \emptyset)$$

and the two special isolated configurations that are not broken twice :

$$B_\star(b) = \mathcal{M}(b, \star) \times \{\star\} = \{(\gamma_-, \star), (\gamma_+, \star)\}$$

where  $\star$  is seen as the constant sphere in  $\mathcal{M}(\star, \emptyset)$ .

Upper and lower gluings can be performed on  $B'(b)$ , but have to be replaced by the relevant Floer steps on  $B_\star(b)$ , and we let

$$(20) \quad \begin{aligned} \sharp^\bullet(\gamma_\pm, \star) &= (\gamma_\mp, \star) \\ \sharp_\bullet(\gamma_\pm, \star) &= (\gamma_\pm, \beta_\star, \alpha_\star) \end{aligned}$$

If the latter was already discussed, observe the former is rather a Morse step. To see it as a Floer step, consider the moduli space of solutions  $(u, R)$  of  $(F_{4,R})$  such that  $u(-\infty) \in W^u(b)$ , but restrict attention to the boundary component given by  $R = 0$  : the configurations  $(\gamma_\pm, \star)$ , regarded as such configurations that underwent a Morse break, are related by the moduli space obtained by gluing at the Morse break and preserving the  $R = 0$  condition.

Defined in this way, the maps  $\sharp^\bullet$  and  $\sharp_\bullet$  form two involutions on  $B(b)$  again, and iterated composition of alternately  $\sharp^\bullet$  and  $\sharp_\bullet$  defines a walk, still called a crocodile walk, whose orbits are all cyclic.

*Remark 20.* Notice for later use that the steps used in the definition of  $\sharp_\bullet$  are all Floer loop steps.




FIGURE 10. The orbit  $W_\star(b)$  of the crocodile walk associated to an index 1 Morse critical point  $b$ .

**Definition 2.15.** The orbit of  $(\gamma_-, \star)$  starting with a lower gluing will be denoted by  $W_\star(b)$ .

It is a cyclic sequence of the following form

$$(\gamma^-, \star), (\gamma^-, \beta_\star, \alpha_\star), (\gamma_1, \beta_1, \alpha_1), \dots, (\gamma_N, \beta_N, \alpha_N), (\gamma^+, \beta_\star, \alpha_\star), (\gamma^+, \star).$$

where

- $N$  is even (the orbits being cyclic, they have to count the same number of upper and lower steps, and hence an even number of elements),
- for  $1 \leq i \leq N$ 
  - $\gamma_i \in \mathcal{M}(b, y)$  for some  $y \in \{\star\} \cup \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_1(H)$ ,
  - $\beta_i \in \mathcal{M}(y, x)$  for some  $x \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_0(H)$ ,
  - $\alpha_i \in \mathcal{M}(x, \emptyset)$ ,
- for all  $i$  with  $0 \leq i < N/2$  :

$$(\gamma_{2i}, \beta_{2i}) \overset{\#}{\longleftrightarrow} (\gamma_{2i+1}, \beta_{2i+1}) \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha_{2i} = \alpha_{2i+1}$$

$$\gamma_{2i+1} = \gamma_{2i+2} \quad \text{and} \quad (\beta_{2i+1}, \alpha_{2i+1}) \overset{\#}{\longleftrightarrow} (\beta_{2i+2}, \alpha_{2i+2}).$$

(with the convention  $(\gamma_0, \beta_0) = (\gamma_-, \beta_\star)$  and  $(\gamma_{N+1}, \beta_{N+1}) = (\gamma_+, \beta_\star)$ ).

In particular (recall remark 20), the sequence of lower steps

$$(21) \quad (\star, \beta_\star, \alpha_\star), \dots, (\alpha_{2i-1}, \beta_{2i-1}, \beta_{2i}, \alpha_{2i}), \dots, (\alpha_\star, \beta_\star, \star)$$

form a Floer loop.




FIGURE 11. Half suspensions of the steps  $(\beta_\star, \alpha_\star) \overset{\#}{\longleftrightarrow} \star$  and  $(\gamma_+, \star) \overset{\#}{\longleftrightarrow} (\gamma_-, \star)$




FIGURE 12. The disc  $\Delta(W_\star(b))$

The construction of the polyhedron  $\Delta(W_\star(b))$  still makes sense for this special orbit : exactly two new kinds of moduli spaces have to be taken into account, namely the ones associated to the steps

$$(\gamma_\pm, \star) \xleftrightarrow{\#} (\gamma_\pm, \beta_\star, \alpha_\star) \quad \text{and} \quad (\gamma_+, \star) \xleftrightarrow{\#} (\gamma_-, \star).$$

In both cases the bottom end of the configurations are free and the half suspension of the relevant moduli space component is endowed with a continuous evaluation map.

In the former however, one side is not associated to a broken trajectory but to the constant one  $\star$  and the half suspension is seen as having 4 sides. The evaluation map restricts to (see figure 11)

- $\beta_\star|_{\mathbb{R}}$  and  $\alpha_\star|_{\mathbb{R}}$  (suitably rescaled using the action) on the broken side
- the constant path  $\{\star\}$  on the “non broken” side
- the evaluation in  $M$  of the Floer step  $(\beta_\star, \alpha_\star) \xleftrightarrow{\#} \star$  on the bottom.

In the latter, the half suspension can again be represented by a pentagon and the evaluation map restricts to (see figure 11)

- $\gamma_+$  and  $\gamma_-$  on the upper left and right sides,
- the constant trajectory  $\star$  on the lower left and right sides,
- the concatenation  $\gamma_+ \cdot \gamma_-$  on the bottom side.

The gluing construction used in (18) adapts straightforwardly to the 3 special steps and results in a disc endowed with a continuous evaluation map to  $M$

$$(22) \quad \Delta(W_\star(b)) \xrightarrow{\text{ev}} M.$$

The restriction of the evaluation map to the boundary is the concatenation of the trajectories  $\gamma_+$  and  $\gamma_-$  and of the Floer loop formed by the lower steps used in the crocodile walk.

### 3. GENERATION OF THE FUNDAMENTAL GROUP

Let  $f$  be a Morse function having a single minimum at  $\star$ , and  $g$  a Riemannian metric on  $M$  such that the pair  $(f, g)$  is Morse mole, and all the relevant hybrid moduli spaces are cut out transversely.

Recall the Morse version of the definitions 2.4 and 2.7 : each choice of orientation on the unstable manifold of each index 1 Morse critical point defines a path we call a Morse step (notice that since  $f$  has a single minimum, all the steps are in fact loops). Picking an arbitrary orientation for each such point  $b$  allows to represent the associated Morse steps algebraically as  $b^\pm$ , and hence to identify the group of Morse loops  $\mathcal{L}(f, \star)$  to the free group generated by  $\text{Crit}_1(f)$ .

#### 3.1. From Floer to Morse loops.



**Lemma 3.1.** *There exist a group morphism  $\mathcal{L}(H, \star) \xrightarrow{\phi} \mathcal{L}(f, \star)$  making the following diagram commutative :*

$$(23) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{L}(H, \star) & \xrightarrow{\text{ev}} & \pi_1(M, \star) , \\ \downarrow \phi & & \parallel \text{Id} \\ \mathcal{L}(f, \star) & \xrightarrow{\text{ev}} & \pi_1(M, \star) \end{array}$$

*i.e. such that*

$$\forall w \in \mathcal{L}(H, \star), \quad \text{ev}(\phi(w)) \sim \text{ev}(w) \quad \text{in } \pi_1(M, \star)$$

*Proof.* Pushing a generic topological loop  $\gamma$  down by the flow of the Morse function  $f$  deforms it into a Morse loop  $\varphi_f^{+\infty}(\gamma)$ , i.e. a word in the index 1 critical points. Here generic means that the loop avoids the stable manifolds of all the index  $k \geq 2$  Morse critical points. Our genericity assumption allows to assume that the evaluation of Floer loops are indeed generic in this sens, and we get a well defined map

$$(24) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}(H, \star) & \xrightarrow{\phi} & \mathcal{L}(f, \star) \\ \gamma & \mapsto & \varphi_f^{+\infty}(\text{ev}(\gamma)). \end{array}$$

This map is obviously compatible both with the concatenation and cancellation rules, and hence induces a group morphism

$$(25) \quad \mathcal{L}(H, \star) \xrightarrow{\phi} \mathcal{L}(f, \star)$$

Finally,  $\phi$  is defined using a deformation and hence preserves the homotopy class, which means that the diagram (25) is commutative.  $\square$

Since the second row of (23) is onto, theorem 2.8 comes down to proving that any Morse loop can be deformed into a Floer loop. Unfortunately, this deformation can not be obtained like  $\phi$  by pushing a loop down by a flow, since there is no such thing as a Floer flow on the loop space.

However, a reinterpretation of  $\phi$  in terms of moduli spaces and crocodile walks can be given, allowing to generalize this definition to the Floer setting and obtain a map in the reverse direction. This reinterpretation is quickly sketched below, to serve as an introduction for the reverse construction and to stress that the two constructions are essentially the same, but will not be discussed in details and could be skipped by the reader. The construction in the reverse direction on the other hand, for which all the relevant technical material was already introduced in section 2.4.3, will be discussed in the next section.

Consider a Floer loop step  $\sigma = (\alpha, \beta, \beta', \alpha')$  through some  $y \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_1(H)$ . From our genericity assumption, the Morse flow line  $\gamma_\alpha$  (resp.  $\gamma_{\alpha'}$ ) passing through the center  $\alpha(+\infty)$  (resp.  $\alpha'(+\infty)$ ) of  $\alpha$  (resp.  $\alpha'$ ) ends at  $\star$ . Denote by  $\bar{\alpha}$  (resp.  $\bar{\alpha}'$ ) the configuration consisting of  $\alpha$  (resp.  $\alpha'$ ) and the piece of trajectory  $\gamma_\alpha$  (resp.  $\gamma_{\alpha'}$ ) running from  $\alpha(+\infty)$  (resp.  $\alpha'(+\infty)$ ) down to  $\star$ .

A crocodile walk can be run on the space of configurations consisting of

- a trajectory from  $y$  to some  $x \in \text{Crit}_1(f) \cup \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_0(H)$ ,
- a trajectory from  $x$  to  $\star$ ,
- the (trivial !) Morse trajectory  $\star \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{Morse}}(\star, \emptyset)$ .




FIGURE 13. From Floer to Morse loops.

Starting with the configuration  $(\beta, \bar{\alpha}, \star)$ , the first upper step consists in gluing  $\beta$  and  $\bar{\alpha}$ . The other end of the associated component of  $\mathcal{M}(y, \star)$  is a configuration broken either at an index 0 Hamiltonian orbit  $x$ , or at an index 1 Morse critical point  $b$  (see figure 13).

In the former case, the new configuration has to be  $(\beta', \bar{\alpha}', \star)$  (simply forget what happened to the Morse flow line and consider the definition of a Floer loop step).

In the latter, the lower part of the configuration is a Morse trajectory  $\gamma_{\pm} \in \mathcal{M}(b, \star) = \{\gamma_-, \gamma_+\}$ . The next (lower) step consists in replacing  $\gamma_{\pm}$  by  $\gamma_{\mp}$  (recall from the comments on definition 2.7 that this can be interpreted as a step along the Morse moduli space  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{Morse}}(b, \emptyset)$ ). The next upper step is then a gluing at  $b$ , and the same alternative holds again.

After a finite number of iterations of this process, the configuration  $(\beta', \bar{\alpha}', \star)$  has to be reached (from an upper step). Similarly to (20), moduli spaces involving interrupted Morse trajectories give rise to the following special steps

$$\begin{aligned} \sharp_{\bullet}(\beta', \bar{\alpha}', \star) &= (\beta', \alpha') \\ \sharp_{\bullet}(\beta', \alpha') &= (\beta, \alpha) \\ \sharp_{\bullet}(\beta, \alpha) &= (\beta, \bar{\alpha}, \star). \end{aligned}$$

that close the walk orbit.

Let  $W_{\sigma}$  be the orbit of the crocodile walk described above. The lower non special steps in this orbit form a sequence of consecutive Morse steps  $\phi(\sigma)$ .

Repeating this process for all the Floer loop steps  $\sigma_i$  in a Floer loop  $\gamma = (\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_N)$  (including the first and last ones  $\star \xleftrightarrow{\sharp} (\beta_{\star}, \alpha_{\star})$  and  $(\beta_{\star}, \alpha_{\star}) \xleftrightarrow{\sharp} \star$  for which it still makes sense), we get a sequence  $\phi(\gamma) = \phi(\sigma_1) \dots \phi(\sigma_N)$  which is a Morse loop. This defines a map  $\mathcal{L}(H, \star) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(f, \star)$  which is a group morphism, and it is a straightforward observation that this map is the same as (25).

Finally, observe that all the discs  $\Delta(W_{\sigma_i})$  patch side to side to form a disc endowed with an evaluation map realizing a homotopy from  $\text{ev}(\gamma)$  to  $\text{ev}(\phi(\gamma))$ .

### 3.2. From Morse to Floer loops.

**Lemma 3.2.** *There exist a group morphism  $\mathcal{L}(f, \star) \xrightarrow{\psi} \mathcal{L}(H, \star)$  making the following diagram commutative :*

$$(26) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{L}(f, \star) & \xrightarrow{\text{ev}} & \pi_1(M, \star) , \\ \downarrow \psi & & \parallel \text{Id} \\ \mathcal{L}(H, \star) & \xrightarrow{\text{ev}} & \pi_1(M, \star) \end{array}$$

i.e. such that

$$\forall w \in \mathcal{L}(f, \star), \quad \text{ev}(\psi(w)) \sim \text{ev}(w) \quad \text{in } \pi_1(M, \star)$$

*Proof.* Let  $b$  be an index 1 critical point of  $f$  and  $(\gamma_b^-, \gamma_b^+)$  be the two Morse trajectories from  $b$  to  $\star$ .

Recall that the crocodile walk on the space

$$B(b) = \bigcup_{y \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_1(H) \cup \{\star\}} \mathcal{M}(b, y) \times \partial \mathcal{M}(y, \emptyset)$$

was described in section 2.4.3. In particular, using the notations introduced there, it has a special orbit  $W_\star(b)$  (see figure 10) of the form

$$(\gamma_b^-, \star), (\gamma_b^-, \beta_\star, \alpha_\star), (\gamma_1, \beta_1, \alpha_1), \dots, (\gamma_N, \beta_N, \alpha_N), (\gamma_b^+, \beta_\star, \alpha_\star), (\gamma_b^+, \star).$$

Recall from (21) that the lower steps in this orbit form a Floer loop. Denoting it by  $\psi(b)$

$$\psi(b) = ((\star, \beta_\star, \alpha_\star), \dots, (\alpha_{2i-1}, \beta_{2i-1}, \beta_{2i}, \alpha_{2i}), \dots, (\alpha_\star, \beta_\star, \star))$$

we get a map

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(f, \star) \xrightarrow{\psi} \mathcal{L}(H, \star).$$

which is obviously compatible with both the concatenation and cancellation rules, and hence induces a group morphism

$$(27) \quad \mathcal{L}(f, \star) \xrightarrow{\psi} \mathcal{L}(H, \star).$$

Finally, the homotopy is provided by the disc  $\Delta(W_\star(b))$  and the evaluation map (22) : its restriction to the boundary is the concatenation of the Morse loop  $\gamma^{-1}$  and the Floer loop  $\psi(b)$ .  $\square$

**3.3. Proof of theorem 2.8.** Theorem 2.8 is a straightforward corollary of lemma 3.2 :

*Proof of theorem 2.8.* Since the first line of (26) is onto, so has to be the second.  $\square$

## 4. RELATIONS AND FUNDAMENTAL GROUPS

It is natural to ask for a Floer theoretic interpretation of the relations. It is the object of this section to provide a family of generators of  $\ker(\mathcal{L}(H, \star) \xrightarrow{\text{ev}} \pi_1(M, \star))$  that can be expressed in terms of Floer and PSS moduli spaces.

*Remark 21.* Although the generated group will not, the proposed generators will depend on the choice of a Morse function (and a metric). A generating family of the relations that would not depend on such a data would be more satisfactory. Unfortunately, it is far from obvious that such a thing does exist.

Moreover, resorting to a Morse function may seem to weaken the construction since Morse functions already give full access to the fundamental group. It is not exactly the case, since the Morse function is used in a different way from the usual one : it is involved in hybrid moduli spaces, mixing Morse and Floer objects, and the present description of the relations depicts how the Morse relations are and have to be transported from the Morse to the Floer setting by some configurations of 1 dimensional moduli spaces, and hence contains some non trivial information.

**4.1. Floer-Morse-Floer relations.** Given a Floer loop  $\gamma \in \mathcal{L}(H, \star)$ , we already observed that the evaluations of  $\psi(\phi(\gamma))$  and  $\gamma$  are homotopic.

**Definition 4.1.** Define the set of “Floer-Morse-Floer relations” as

$$R_{\text{FMF}}(H) = \{\gamma^{-1}\psi(\phi(\gamma)), \gamma \in \mathcal{L}(H, \star)\}$$




FIGURE 14. A relation in  $R_{\text{FMF}}(H)$ .

*Remark 22.* The notation  $R_{\text{FMF}}(H)$  only highlights the dependency on  $H$  but this set depends in fact on all the auxiliary data  $(H, J, f, g, \star)$ .

*Remark 23.* The set  $R_{\text{FMF}}(H)$  is not finite since there is one relation for each Floer loop. However, it is induced by the substitution rule at the Floer loop steps level :

$$\sigma \rightarrow \psi(\phi(\sigma))$$

which is finite.

Since  $\phi$  and  $\psi$  are described in terms of crocodile walk, so can these relations. Glossing over the moduli spaces involving  $\star$ , consider a Floer loop step  $\sigma$  through some  $y_0 \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_1(H)$ . The configurations consisting of

- a trajectory  $\delta$  from  $y_0$  to some  $z \in \text{Crit}_1(f) \cup \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_0(H)$
- a trajectory  $\gamma$  from  $z$  to some  $y \in \{\star\} \cup \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_1(H)$ ,
- a trajectory  $\beta$  from  $y$  to some  $x \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_0(H)$ ,
- a trajectory  $\alpha \in \mathcal{M}(x, \emptyset)$

are broken three times and hence present 3 levels where to perform a gluing (or more generally a step). The relation is obtained by running the crocodile walk on the two lower gluings “from  $\star$  to  $\star$ ”, then performing one upper gluing, and repeating this process.

**4.2. Relations associated to Morse 2-cells.** Given an index 2 Morse critical point  $c$  of  $f$ , let  $\rho_c$  be the relation in  $\mathcal{L}(f, \star)$  given by the boundary of the associated 2 cell and define :

$$(28) \quad R_{M2}(f) = \{\rho_c, c \in \text{Crit}_2(f)\}$$

$$(29) \quad R_{M2}(H) = \{\psi(\rho_c), c \in \text{Crit}_2(f)\}$$

*Remark 24.* The notation  $R_{M2}(H)$  only highlights the dependency on  $H$  but this set depends in fact on all the auxiliary data  $(H, J, f, g, \star)$ .




FIGURE 15. A Floer relation associated to a Morse 2-cell.

*Remark 25.* For all  $\rho \in R_{M2}(H)$  we have  $\text{ev}(\rho) = 1$  in  $\pi_1(M, \star)$ , so that  $R_{M2}(H) \subset \mathcal{R}(H, \star)$ .

*Remark 26.* These relations can also be described in terms of crocodile walks. Glossing over the moduli spaces involving  $\star$  again, consider an index 2 Morse critical point  $c$  and the configurations consisting of

- a trajectory  $\delta$  from  $c$  to some  $z \in \text{Crit}_1(f)$ ,
- a trajectory  $\gamma$  from  $z$  to some  $y \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_1(H) \cup \text{Crit}_0(f)$ ,
- a trajectory  $\beta$  from  $y$  to some  $x \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_0(H)$ ,
- a trajectory  $\alpha \in \mathcal{M}(x, \emptyset)$ .

The relation associated to  $c$  can be obtained using the same algorithm as discussed previously, i.e. running the crocodile walk on the two lower levels “from  $\star$  to  $\star$ ”, then performing one upper step, and repeating this process.

**4.3. Fundamental group.** We can finally define the subgroup of relations :

**Definition 4.2.** Denote by  $\mathcal{R}(H, \star)$  the normal subgroup of  $\mathcal{L}(H, \star)$  generated by  $R_{\text{FMF}}(H)$  and  $R_{\text{M2}}(H)$  :

$$\mathcal{R}(H, \star) = \langle R_{\text{FMF}}(H), R_{\text{M2}}(H) \rangle .$$

*Remark 27.* The group  $\mathcal{R}(H, \star)$  obviously depends on  $(H, J, \star)$ , but it is a consequence of theorem 4.4 that it does not depend on  $(f, g)$ .

**Definition 4.3.** The Floer fundamental group associated to  $(H, J, \star)$  is defined as the group

$$\pi_1(H, \star) = \mathcal{L}(H, \star) / \mathcal{R}(H, \star).$$

*Remark 28.* The group should be denoted as  $\pi_1(H, J, \star)$  to emphasize its dependency on  $J$  but it is kept implicit to reduce notations.

In the same way, let  $\mathcal{R}(f, \star) = \langle R_{\text{M2}}(f) \rangle$  be the normal subgroup of  $\mathcal{L}(f, \star)$  generated by the boundary of Morse 2-cells,  $\pi_1(f) := \mathcal{L}(f, \star) / \mathcal{R}(f, \star)$  and recall the well known fact that  $\pi_1(f, \star) \simeq \pi_1(M, \star)$ .

**Theorem 4.4.** The evaluation induces a group isomorphism

$$\pi_1(H, \star) \xrightarrow{\text{ev}} \pi_1(M, \star).$$

The maps  $\phi$  and  $\psi$  also induce isomorphisms which are inverse one of the other :

$$\pi_1(H, \star) \xrightleftharpoons[\psi]{\phi} \pi_1(f, \star).$$

*Proof.* (1)  $\psi$  compatibility with the relations :

observe that  $\mathcal{R}(f, \star) = \langle R_{\text{M2}}(f) \rangle$  and  $\psi(\langle R_{\text{M2}}(f) \rangle) \subset \langle \psi(R_{\text{M2}}(f)) \rangle$ . Since  $\psi(R_{\text{M2}}(f)) = R_{\text{M2}}(H)$  and  $\langle R_{\text{M2}}(H) \rangle \subset \mathcal{R}(H, \star)$ , we have

$$\psi(\mathcal{R}(f, \star)) \subset \mathcal{R}(H, \star).$$

(2)  $\phi$  compatibility with the relations :

Similarly,  $\phi(\mathcal{R}(H, \star)) \subset \langle \phi(R_{\text{FMF}}(H)) \cup \phi(R_{\text{M2}}(H)) \rangle$ . But for  $\rho \in R_{\text{FMF}}(H) \cup R_{\text{M2}}(H)$ , we have  $\text{ev}(\phi(\rho)) = \text{ev}(\rho) = 1$ , so that

$$\phi(\mathcal{R}(H, \star)) \subset \mathcal{R}(f, \star).$$

- (3)  $\phi \circ \psi = \text{Id}_{\pi_1(f, \star)}$  :  
This follows directly from  $\text{ev} \circ \phi \circ \psi = \text{ev}$ . In particular this implies  $\phi$  surjectivity and  $\psi$  injectivity.
- (4)  $\psi \circ \phi = \text{Id}_{\pi_1(H, \star)}$  :  
This is built in the definition of the relations  $R_{\text{FMF}}(H)$  : for  $\gamma \in \mathcal{L}(H, \star)$ , we have  $\gamma^{-1}\psi(\phi(\gamma)) \in R_{\text{FMF}}(H)$ , so that  $\gamma = \psi(\phi(\gamma))$  in  $\pi_1(H, \star)$ . This implies  $\phi$  injectivity and  $\psi$  surjectivity.
- (5)  $\ker(\text{ev} : \mathcal{L}(H, \star) \rightarrow \pi_1(M, \star) = \mathcal{R}(H, \star))$  :  
The relation  $\mathcal{R}(H, \star) \subset \ker \text{ev}$  is obvious since this is true for all the generators of  $\mathcal{R}(H, \star)$ . Conversely, let  $\gamma \in \mathcal{L}(H, \star)$  such that  $\text{ev}(\gamma) = 1$  in  $\pi_1(M, \star)$ . Then  $\text{ev}(\phi(\gamma)) = 1$  so that  $\phi(\gamma) \in \mathcal{R}(f, \star)$ . As a consequence

$$\psi(\phi(\gamma)) \in \psi(\mathcal{R}(f, \star)) \subset \mathcal{R}(H, \star).$$

Finally, since  $\gamma^{-1}\psi(\phi(\gamma)) \in \mathcal{R}(H, \star)$ , we have  $\gamma \in \mathcal{R}(H, \star)$ .

This ends the proof that  $\pi_1(H, \star) \xrightarrow{\text{ev}} \pi_1(M, \star)$  is injective, and hence an isomorphism since it was already proven to be surjective.  $\square$

## 5. APPLICATION AND PROOF OF THEOREM 2.11.

**5.1. Generating  $\pi_1(M)$  with steps.** The theorem 2.10 is a direct consequence of a weaker version of theorem 2.8 where Floer loops are replaced by Floer steps.

*Proof of theorem 2.10.* Fix a generic set of data  $(H, J, \star, f, g)$  where  $\star$  is the single minimum of the Morse function  $f$ . Let  $\sigma_\star$  denote the special step  $\star \xleftrightarrow{H} (\beta_\star, \alpha_\star)$ . Let  $\mathcal{S}(H)$  be the free group generated by all the Floer loop steps but the special one.

Recall that the map  $\phi$  was defined at the step level :

$$(30) \quad \mathcal{S}(H) \xrightarrow{\phi} \mathcal{L}(f, \star) \xrightarrow{\text{ev}} \pi_1(M, \star)$$

(notice that although Floer loop steps evaluate as free paths in  $M$  and not necessarily as based loops, they are still pushed down into Morse based loops by  $\phi$  because the Morse function was chosen to have only one index 0 critical point).

Notice that the left hand side of (17) is nothing but the number of generators of  $\mathcal{S}(H)$ , so that theorem 2.10 reduces to proving that in (30),  $\text{ev} \circ \phi$  is onto.

Observe now that in a loop  $w \in \tilde{\mathcal{L}}(H, \star)$ , the only occurrences of  $\sigma_\star$  and  $\sigma_\star^{-1}$  are :

- $\sigma_\star$  at the beginning of  $w$ ,
- $\sigma_\star^{-1}$  at the end of  $w$ ,
- eventual sequences  $(\sigma_\star^{-1}\sigma_\star)$  within  $w$ .

In particular, this means that removing  $\sigma_\star$  and  $\sigma_\star^{-1}$  at the ends of the loops defines an injective group morphism

$$\mathcal{L}(H, \star) \xhookrightarrow{\tau} \mathcal{S}(H) .$$

We end up with the following commutative diagram :

$$(31) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} \mathcal{L}(H, \star) & \xrightarrow{\phi} & \mathcal{L}(f, \star) & \xrightarrow{\text{ev}} & \pi_1(M, \star) \\ \downarrow \tau & & \downarrow \tau' & & \downarrow \tau'' \\ \mathcal{S}(H) & \xrightarrow{\phi} & \mathcal{L}(f, \star) & \xrightarrow{\text{ev}} & \pi_1(M, \star) \end{array}$$

where  $\tau'$  and  $\tau''$  are the conjugation by  $\phi(\sigma_\star^{-1})$  and  $\text{ev}(\phi(\sigma_\star^{-1}))$  respectively. In particular, surjectivity of the first row implies that of the second.  $\square$

**5.2. Proof of theorem 2.11.** In this section, we want to prove theorem 2.11, namely that if  $\pi_1(M) \neq \{1\}$ , then every non-degenerate Hamiltonian  $H$  should have at least one contractible 1 periodic orbit of index 1 (i.e. Conley-Zehnder index  $1 - n$ ) with non vanishing multiplicity.

This is not a consequence of the above construction, but uses similar ideas arranged slightly differently : it is based on a variant of the crocodile walk to patch (suspensions) of 1-dimensional PSS moduli spaces together and fill any Morse loop with a disc when there are no index 1 Hamiltonian orbit.

Let  $H$  be a non degenerate Hamiltonian, and pick a triple  $(J, f, g)$  where  $J$  is an (eventually time dependent) almost complex structure compatible with  $\omega$ ,  $f$  a Morse function with a single minimum denoted by  $\star$  and  $g$  a Riemannian metric such that  $(H, J, \star, f, g)$  satisfies our transversality assumptions. We pick coherent orientations on all the 0 and 1 dimensional moduli spaces  $\mathcal{M}(b, x)$  for  $b \in \text{Crit}_{0,1}(f)$  and  $x \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_0(H) \cup \text{Crit}_0(f)$ .

Suppose  $H$  has no index 1 orbit, or more precisely that it has no index 1 orbit with non vanishing multiplicity : this means there are no Floer trajectories from an index 1 to an index 0 orbit having an augmentation. For convenience, let

$$\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_0(H)^* = \{x \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_0(H), \mathcal{M}(x, \emptyset) \neq \emptyset\}.$$

Our assumption can then be written as :

$$\forall y \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_1(H), \forall x \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_0(H)^*, \mathcal{M}(y, x) = \emptyset.$$

Let  $b$  be an index 1 Morse critical point, such that the unstable manifold of  $b$  defines a non trivial loop  $\gamma$  in  $M$ , and let  $\gamma_-$  and  $\gamma_+$  be the two Morse flow lines rooted at  $b$ . For convenience, we consider  $\gamma$  as based at  $b$  and let :

$$\gamma = \gamma_+ \cdot \gamma_-^{-1}.$$

For  $x \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_0(H)^*$  consider the space

$$B(b) = \{\gamma_-, \gamma_+\} \times \mathcal{M}(\star, x).$$



Since  $H$  has no index 1 orbit related to  $x$  by a Floer trajectory,  $B(b)$  is the set of all broken hybrid trajectories from  $b$  to  $x$ .

In particular, gluing  $\gamma_{\pm}$  with a trajectory  $\beta \in \mathcal{M}(\star, x)$  defines a 1 dimensional family of trajectories from  $b$  to  $x$  whose other end has to be of the same form. This defines a one to one correspondence :

$$\begin{aligned} B(b) &\xrightarrow{\sigma} B(b) \\ (\gamma_{\epsilon}, \beta) &\mapsto (\gamma_{\epsilon'}, \beta') \quad \text{such that } (\gamma_{\epsilon}, \beta) \xleftrightarrow{\#} (\gamma_{\epsilon'}, \beta') . \end{aligned}$$

Permuting  $\gamma_{-}$  and  $\gamma_{+}$  defines another one to one correspondence

$$\begin{aligned} B(b) &\xrightarrow{\tau} B(b) \\ (\gamma_{\pm}, \beta) &\mapsto (\gamma_{\mp}, \beta) . \end{aligned}$$

Notice both  $\sigma$  and  $\tau$  reverse the orientation.

Consider now an orbit of  $\rho = \tau \circ \sigma$ . It has to be cyclic, and is a sequence

$$(\gamma_{\epsilon_1}, \beta_1), \dots, (\gamma_{\epsilon_k}, \beta_k)$$

(with  $\epsilon_i = \pm 1$ ) such that  $(\gamma_{\epsilon_i}, \beta_i) \xleftrightarrow{\#} (\gamma_{-\epsilon_{i+1}}, \beta_{i+1})$ , with the convention that  $(\gamma_{\epsilon_{k+1}}, \beta_{k+1}) = (\gamma_{\epsilon_1}, \beta_1)$ .

To each gluing, is associated a one dimensional space, and we let  $\Sigma_i$  be its suspension. It is a diamond, endowed with an evaluation map to  $M$  that coincides with

- $\gamma_{\epsilon_i}$  on the upper left edge,
- $\beta_i$  on the lower left edge,
- $\gamma_{-\epsilon_{i+1}}$  on the upper right edge,
- $\beta_{i+1}$  on the lower right edge.

Gluing all these diamonds side by side along the lower edge provides a disc, endowed with a continuous evaluation map to  $M$ , whose restriction to the boundary is

$$\gamma_{\epsilon_1}^{-1} \gamma_{-\epsilon_2} \gamma_{\epsilon_2}^{-1} \dots \gamma_{-\epsilon_k} \gamma_{\epsilon_k}^{-1} \gamma_{-\epsilon_1}.$$

This loop is therefore trivial, but  $\gamma_{-\epsilon_i} \gamma_{\epsilon_i}^{-1} = \gamma^{-\epsilon_i}$  so  $\gamma^{\sum \epsilon_i} = 1$ . Moreover, the orientation of the couple  $(\gamma_{\epsilon_i}, \beta_i)$  is constant with respect to  $i$  (because one moves from one to the next by two gluings and the orientation is reversed by each gluing) and it can be supposed to be positive without loss of generality. This means that  $\epsilon_i = \epsilon(\beta_i)$  for all  $i$  and hence  $\sum \epsilon_i = \sum \epsilon(\beta_i)$  (where  $\epsilon(\beta_i)$  is the orientation of  $\beta_i$ ). As a consequence, we get

$$\gamma^{\sum \epsilon(\beta_i)} \sim 1 \text{ in } \pi_1(M, \star).$$

Observe now that the orbits of  $\rho$  induce a partition of  $\mathcal{M}(\star, x)$ , so repeating this for all the orbits  $O_1, \dots, O_N$  of  $\rho$ , we derive

$$\gamma^{\sum_{O_1} \epsilon(\beta_i)} \dots \gamma^{\sum_{O_N} \epsilon(\beta_i)} = \gamma^{\sum_{\beta \in \mathcal{M}(\star, x)} \epsilon(\beta)} = \gamma^{n_x} \sim 1 \text{ in } \pi_1(M, \star),$$

where  $n_x = \sharp \mathcal{M}(\star, x)$  is the algebraic number of elements in  $\mathcal{M}(\star, x)$ . Recall this number is the component along  $x$  of the image of  $\star$  under the PSS

morphism from the Morse to the Floer complex :

$$PSS_{MF}(\star) = \sum_{x \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_0(H)} n_x x.$$

Let  $PSS_{FM}$  be the PSS morphism from the Floer to the Morse complex. Since  $PSS_{FM} \circ PSS_{MF}$  induces the identity in homology, we have

$$\sum_{x \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_0(H)} n_x m_x = 1$$

where  $m_x = \sharp_{\text{alg}}(\mathcal{M}(x, \emptyset))$ . In particular we also have  $\sum_{x \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_0(H)^*} n_x m_x = 1$ .

As a consequence we have

$$\gamma = \gamma^{\sum_{x \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_0(H)^*} n_x m_x} = 1 \text{ in } \pi_1(M, \star).$$

This is a contradiction, since we supposed  $\gamma$  was non trivial. This ends the proof of theorem 2.11.

## REFERENCES

- [1] V.I. Arnold, *Méthodes mathématiques de la mécanique classique*, Mir, Moscou, 1976.
- [2] J.-F. Barraud & O. Cornea, *Lagrangian intersections and the Serre spectral sequence*. Ann. of Math. (2) 166 (2007), no. 3, 657–722.
- [3] P. Biran & O. Cornea, *Lagrangian topology and enumerative geometry*. Geom. Topol. 16 (2012), no. 2, 963–1052.
- [4] M. Damian, *On the stable Morse number of a closed manifold*. Bull. London Math. Soc. 34 (2002), no. 4, 420–430.
- [5] A. Floer, *Cuplength estimates on Lagrangian intersections*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 42 (1989), no. 4, 335–356.
- [6] A. Floer, *Morse theory for Lagrangian intersections*, J. Differential Geom. 28 (1988), no. 3, 513–547.
- [7] A. Floer, *Witten’s complex and infinite-dimensional Morse theory*, J. Differential Geom. 30 (1989), no. 1, 207–221.
- [8] A. Floer, *Symplectic fixed points and holomorphic spheres*, Commun. Math. Phys. 120 (1989), 575–611.
- [9] M. Gromov, *Pseudo-holomorphic curves in symplectic manifolds*, Invent. Math. 82 (1985), p. 307–347.
- [10] D. McDuff & D. Salamon, *J-holomorphic curves and symplectic topology*. Second edition. American Mathematical Society Colloquium Publications, 52. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2012. xiv+726 pp. ISBN: 978-0-8218-8746-2.
- [11] Y.-G. Oh & K. Zhu *Floer trajectories with immersed nodes and scale-dependent gluing*, Journal of Symplectic Geometry. 9 (2011), no. 4, 483–636.
- [12] K. Ono & A. Pajitnov, *On the fixed points of a Hamiltonian diffeomorphism in presence of fundamental group*, preprint, arXiv:1405.2505.
- [13] S. Piunikhin, D. Salamon & M. Schwarz, *Symplectic Floer-Donaldson theory and quantum cohomology*, in: Contact and Symplectic Geometry, ed. by C. B. Thomas, Cambridge Univ. Press 1996
- [14] V. V. Sharko, *Functions on manifolds*, Translations of Mathematical Monographs, Vol. 131, AMS, 1993, ISBN = 0-8218-4578-0.